

United States Government

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: October 17, 2003

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265/SA-127)

TO: David Byrnes
Fish and Wildlife Project Manager - KEWL-4

Proposed Action: Yakima Tributary Access and Habitat - Ahtanum Creek

Project No: 2002-025-00

Watershed Management Techniques or Actions Addressed Under This Supplement Analysis (See App. A of the Watershed Management Program EIS): 1.3 Restoration of Channelized River and Stream Reaches, 1.5 Install Grade Control Structures and Check Dams, Install Large Woody Debris Structures, 1.8 Bank Protection through Vegetation Management, 1.9 Structural Bank Protection Using Bioengineering Methods, 1.15 Fish Passage Enhancement – Fishways, 2.11 Hand Pulling, 3.7 Critical Area Planting, 4.1 Irrigation Water Management, 4.2 Water Measuring Devices, 4.10 Water Conveyance – Pipeline, 4.23 Intake and Return Diversion Screens, 4.25 Consolidate/Replace Irrigation Diversion Dams, 6.14 Vegetation Stabilization – Critical Area Planting, 6.15 Vegetation Stabilization – Brush/Weed Management

Location: Yakima County, Washington

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and the North Yakima Conservation District

Description of the Proposed Action: The Bonneville Power Administration is proposing to fund a portion of a fish passage, diversion screening, and habitat improvement project with the North Yakima Conservation District on lower Ahtanum Creek in Yakima County, Washington. Additional funding for this project is being provided by the Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board. The proposed project will involve the installation of root wads, fish passage, and screening structures, the restoration of a portion of the floodplain, and the removal of automobiles and an old check dam structure on Ahtanum Creek. The goal of this project is to restore anadromous fish habitat and access to the upper creek and its tributaries and enhance salmon, steelhead, and bull trout productivity within the watershed.

Analysis: The compliance checklist for this project was completed by Mike Tobin with the North Yakima Conservation District (September 9, 2003) and meets the standards and guidelines for the Watershed Management Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD).

The Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed species that may occur in the general vicinity of the project area are Middle Columbia River steelhead, bull trout, bald eagle, and Ute Ladies' tresses. Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, BPA submitted a Biological Evaluation to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on August 29, 2003. BPA determined that the project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect bull trout, bald eagle, or Ute Ladies'-tresses. USFWS disagreed with BPA's determination for bull trout and requested formal consultation. USFWS issued a Biological Opinion on October 3, 2003 (see attached). USFWS concluded that the proposed actions were not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of bull trout and will not destroy or adversely modify proposed critical habitat for bull trout. Within the Biological Opinion, USFWS identified a set of required terms and

conditions for the project that are designed to minimize take of bull trout. All identified terms and conditions contained in the attached Biological Opinion must be implemented accordingly.

BPA determined that ESA consultation for Middle Columbia River steelhead and Essential Fish Habitat consultation for chinook and coho salmon were covered under BPA's Habitat Improvement Program Programmatic Biological Opinion with NOAA Fisheries. All applicable terms and conditions contained in the Programmatic Biological Opinion must be implemented accordingly (see attached HIP BO Consistency Form). Project design was approved by Bill Graeber with NOAA Fisheries. A minor modification to the instream work window was approved by Dale Bambrick with NOAA Fisheries, extending the work window to October 31, 2003.

Consultation associated with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act was handled by Bill Graeber with NOAA Fisheries. NOAA Fisheries is the pass-through agency for Federal funds distributed to the Washington Salmon Recovery Funding Board, which is funding a portion of this project. NOAA Fisheries determined that the proposed action is not an undertaking that has the potential to cause affects to cultural and/or historic properties. In the unlikely event that archaeological material is discovered as part of this project, an archaeologist should be notified immediately and work halted in the vicinity of the finds until they can be inspected and assessed.

Standard water quality protection procedures and Best Management Practices will be followed during the implementation of the Ahtanum Creek Project. No construction is authorized to begin until the proponent has obtained all applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals. Permits and approvals applied for or granted for this project include a Washington State Environmental Policy Act Determination of Nonsignificance, a County Shoreline and Floodplain Management Exemption, a State Hydraulic Project Approval, a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers 404 Permit, and a State 401 Water Quality Certification.

Public involvement will take place as part of the Ahtanum Creek project. Washington State Environmental Policy Act rules require the lead agency use reasonable methods to inform the public and other agencies that an environmental document is being prepared or is available and that public hearing(s), if any, will be held. For this project Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife will give public notice by one or more of the following methods: notifying public and private groups and individuals with known interest in the proposal; publication in a newspaper of general circulation in the area; and/or posting the property.

Findings: The project is generally consistent with Section 7.6A.2, 7.6B.3, & 7.8E.1, of the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. This Supplement Analysis finds 1) that the

proposed actions are substantially consistent with the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265) and ROD, and, 2) that there are no new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed actions or their impacts. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is required.

/s/ Shannon C. Stewart

Shannon C. Stewart
Environmental Specialist

CONCUR:

/s/ Robert W. Beraud for

Thomas C. McKinney
NEPA Compliance Officer

DATE: 10/16/03

Attachments:

NEPA Compliance Checklist
NOAA Fisheries HIP BO Consistency Form
USFWS Biological Opinion, October 3, 2003
NOAA Fisheries NHPA Section 106 Determination

cc: (w/o attachments)

Mr. Stephen Kropp – Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Mike Tobin – North Yakima Conservation District